

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 – 11, 13 – 17, 19, 20 and 22 – 27 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3 – 8, 10, 11 and 13 – 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pentzien (U.S. Pat. No. 4,119,343) in view of Apissomian (U.S. Pat. No. 4,411,468). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended herein to include a first dual-rate leaf spring having a first end anchored to the upper casting on a first surface of the first dual-rate leaf spring and a second end anchored to the lower casting on the first surface. The first dual-rate leaf spring extends angularly between the upper and lower castings. Claim 11 has been amended to include first and second leaf springs interconnecting the upper and lower castings for relative pivotal motion therebetween, the first and second leaf springs each including a first surface that lies adjacent to both the upper and lower castings. The first and second leaf springs extend angularly between the upper and lower castings.

Pentzien fails to teach or suggest upper and lower castings that are anchored to a common surface or side of a leaf spring that extends angularly therebetween. More specifically, a flexure member 47 extends between upper and lower angle irons 48,46, respectively. The upper angle iron 48 is anchored to one surface of the flexure member 47 and the lower angle iron 46 is anchored to an opposite surface of the flexure

member 47. Applicants further note that Apissomian fails to cure the deficient teachings of Pentzien. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 3 – 8, 10 and 13 – 15, Applicants respectfully note that each ultimately depends from one of claims 1 and 11, which define over the prior art, as discussed in detail above. Therefore, claims 3 – 8, 10 and 13 – 15 also define over the prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 9 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for recognizing the allowability of the subject-matter of claims 9 and 16. Applicants have presently refrained from rewriting either claims 9 or 16 into independent form in view of the amendments detailed herein.

ALLOWED CLAIMS

Claims 17, 19, 20 and 22 – 27 are allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for the favorable consideration of the subject-matter of claims 17, 19, 20 and 22 – 27 and anticipate favorable consideration of the remaining claims.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 1, 2004

By: 

Ryan P. McCarthy
Reg. No. 50,636

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600